### Title II Project Application **Medford District Resource Advisory Committee**

	1. Project Number (Assigned by federal unit):OR-118-12
	•
2.	Project Name: Rattlesnake Creek Culvert Replacement 3. County: Douglas
4.	Project Sponsor: Loren Wittenberg, BLM Glendale RA 5. Date: 12-12-2001
6.	<b>Sponsors Phone #:</b> 541-618-2297
7.	Sponsor's E-mail: lwittenb@or.blm.gov
	Project Location (attach project area map)
	a. 4 <sup>th</sup> Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known):  Cow Creek (17100302)  b. 5 <sup>th</sup> Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known):  Middle Cow Creek (1710030207)  c. Legal Location: Township 33S Range 07W Section(s) 02 center
	d. BLM District <u>Medford</u> e. BLM Resource Area <u>Glendale</u>
	f. National Forest g. Forest Service District
1.	h. State / Private / Other lands involved? X Yes No
	Work would occur on Douglas County ROW and possibly adjacent landowners.
9.	Statement of Project Goals and Objectives:

### 9

Project would increase size of culvert to accommodate 100 year flow event and provide for full aquatic passage in all but extreme high flows.

#### **10. Project Description:** (Provide concise description of project and attach map.)

A deteriorating round pipe culvert on Douglas County Road #177 at Rattlesnake Creek is undersized for extreme flood events and at times impedes or completely blocks passage of fish upstream. The current structure is a partial or full barrier to many aquatic species. It is the fisheries biologist opinion based on over 20 years of experience that the structure needs to be replaced. The proposed project involves replacing the existing culvert with a structure that is as wide as the upstream high water channel and provides for a natural streambed substrate. This would be bottomless arch or bridge structure. This type of structure would provide for extreme flood events and migration of all aquatic species.

This project would insure County infrastructure would be maintained and protected from flood damage as well as providing for natural aquatic functions.

11. Coordination of this project with other related project(s) on adjacent lands?

X Yes

BLM has placed several habitat improvement structures upstream of the culvert (log berms) for Coho Salmon and Steelhead spawning and habitat. \$23,000.00 was spent on that project. Other work on culverts restricting migration is planned in the Rattlesnake basin in the future.

#### 12. How does proposed project meet purposes of the Legislation? [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

# Title II Project Application Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

[Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)] [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]
[Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)] [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]
[Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)] [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]
[Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)] [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]
[Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]
[Sec. 2(b)(2)(F)]
_
ironmental
. ~
er 15,
rastructure Maintenance (specify): Major stream culvert replacement[Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)] rastructure Maintenance (specify): Major stream culvert replacement[Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)] rastructure Maintenance (specify): Major stream culvert replacement[Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)] rastructure Maintenance (specify): Major stream culvert replacement[Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)] rate Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(B)]
red? [Sec.
ple
ed? [

18. How is this project in the best public interest? [Sec. 203(b)(7)] Identify benefits to communities?

The project would compliment objectives of the Oregon Salmon Plan and help to increase production of anadromous fish.

19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources?

Aquatic species would be able to use all of mainstem of Rattlesnake Creek.

# Title II Project Application Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

### 20. Status of Project Planning

	n. NEPA Complete:			Yes	X No		
ł	o. If No, give est. date of completion: Spring 20	002					
C	e. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:		X	Yes	$\square$ No	)	
C	d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:			Yes		o ⊠	Not Applicable
$\epsilon$	e. Survey & Manage Complete:			Yes	$\square$ N	0 🛛	Not Applicable
f	7. DSL/ODFW* Permits Obtained:			Yes	X No	C	
٤	g. DLS/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained:			Yes	X No	C	
ŀ	n. SHPO* Concurrence Received:			Yes	X No	C	
i	. Project Design(s) Completed:			Yes	X No	О	
21. Pro	posed Method(s) of Accomplishment						
	posed Method(s) of Accomplishment  ✓ Contract		Fede	ral W	orkford	ce	
	•		Fede Volu			ce	
[						ce	

# Title II Project Application Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

#### 23. Anticipated Project Costs [Sec. 203(b)(3)]

a.	Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$ 139.0	000		
b.	Is this a multi-year funding request? $\Box$ Yes	⊠ No	If yes, then display by fiscal	year
	c. FY02 Request: \$ <u>139,000</u>	f. FY05 R	Request: \$	
	d. FY03 Request: \$	g. FY06 R	Request: \$	
	e. FY04 Request: \$			

	Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution	Requested County Title II Contribution	Other Contributions	Total Available
Item	[Sec. 203(b)(4)]	[Sec. 203(b)(4)]	[Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Funds
24. Field Work & Site Surveys		\$1,500		\$1500
25. NEPA & Sec.7 ESA Consultation		\$6,400		\$6400
26. Permit Acquisition				
27. Project Design & Engineering		\$4,500		\$4500
28. Contract Preparation		\$3,000		\$3000
29. Contract Administration		\$5,000		\$5000
30. Contract Cost		80,000		\$80,000
31. Workforce Cost		\$18,500		\$18,500
32. Materials & Supplies		\$1,000		\$1000
33. Monitoring		\$1,000		\$1000
34. Other				
35. Project Subtotal		\$120,900		\$120,900
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead) (per year for multiple year projects)		18,100		\$18,100
37. Total Cost Estimate		\$139,000	\$	\$139,000

38. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding in Column C. Above [Sec. 203(b)(4)]

N/A

**39.** Monitoring Plan (Sec.203(b)(6)

## Title II Project Application Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

a. What measures or evaluations will be made to determine how well the proposed project meets the desired ecological conditions? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

A spawning survey for coho salmon and or steelhead would be conducted at the appropriate time of the year. The BLM Glendale fish biologist would have the lead responsibility for monitoring.

b. How will the project be evaluated to determine how well the proposed project contributes towards local employment and/or training opportunities, including summer youth jobs programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

N/A

- c. What methods and measures of evaluation will be established to determine how well the proposed project improves the use of, or added value to, any products removed from National Forest System lands consistent with the purposes of this Act? [Sec. 203(b)(6) and Sec. 204(e)(3)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?
- d. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, Item 33)

Amount: \$ 1000